DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 476 SP 018 313

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Clark, Elmer J.: And Others |
| TITLE | Dean's Grant: First Year Report and Evaluation. Volume III. |
| INSTITUTION | Southern Illinois Univ., Carbondale. Coll. of Education. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Special Education (ED), Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | 80 |
| CONTRACT | 790-1150 |
| NOTE | 51p.: For related documents, see SP 018 311-312. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC03 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Attitude Change: Core Curriculum: *Education Courses: Evaluation Criteria: *Evaluation Methods: Higher Education: *Mainstreaming: *Preservice Teacher Education: Program Development: *Program Effectiveness: Student Attitudes: Teacher Attitudes: *Teacher Education Curriculum |
| IDENTIFIERS | Deans Grant Project |

ABSTRACT

This report contains an evaluation of the first year of the Dean's Grant Project at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. The objective of the project was to prepare regular classroom teachers for working in a mainstreamed environment. Three curriculum areas were identified for the incorporation of concepts and methods concerning the teaching of handicapped children: (1) the general techniques and procedures course: (2) the general educational psychology course in learning and development: and (3) the history/philosophy of education course. These courses were selected because all undergraduate students in the College of Education are required to take them. In preparation for this training program, bibliographies and lists of outside support agencies, instructional materials, and diagnostic tools had been developed. This report reviews goals, objectives, and activities and describes the evaluation methodology used. Results are presented of surveys of the University faculty personnel and participating students. In general, materials developed for the course were reviewed favorably and were credited for the positive attitudes expressed by students and teacher educators. Tables present findings on pre-post tests, and a summary of faculty and student receptivity is included. Samples of the evaluation instruments are appended. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED205476.

# DEAN'S GRANT: FIRST YEAR REPORT AND EVALUATION

## Volume III

Office of Special Education - CONTRACT 790 1158

Elmer J. Clark, Dean

Nancy L. Quisenberry, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and Project Director

Sidney R. Miller, Special Education Trainer

John Sachs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nancy Lou Quisenberry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

College of Education
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
Carbondale, IL 62901

1980

SP 018 313

Table of Contents


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Developments Leading to the Dean's Grant Project | 3 |
| The Plan for Institutionalizing Special Education Concepts in the Teacher Education Program | 4 |
| Goals, Objectives, and Activities | 8 |
| Evaluation Methodology | 15 |
| Population | 15 |
| Activities | 16 |
| Settings | 16 |
| Instruments | 16 |
| University Faculty Personnel Survey | 19 |
| Faculty and Student Survey | 19 |
| Checklists | 19 |
| Data Treatment | 19 |
| Results | 20 |
| Faculty Survey | 21 |
| Student Survey | 24 |
| Student Teacher Workshop | 26 |
| Pre-Post Tests | 26 |
| Results | 26 |
| Questionnaire | 27 |
| Summary | 28 |
| Faculty Receptivity | 28 |
| Students | 28 |
| Reference | 29 |
| Appendix A | 30 |
| Appendix B | 32 |

## Charts


Page

Pert Chart of Activities for Southern Illinois University-Carbondale Dean's Grant . . . . . 11

Assessment of Product Information . . . . . 17

## List of Tables

Page

TABLE I Results of Faculty Survey . . . . . 23

TABLE II Results of Student Survey . . . . . 25

## Introduction

Mainstreaming is a concept which requires a receptive attitude and information to make it work in practice. The integration of the handicapped into regular education programs will happen only with planning and program development and appropriate educational placement. One significant aspect of that planning is to prepare regular educators for integration of the handicapped into their classes. That preparation must occur at the pre-service level so that the classroom teacher and building principal have assimilated and accommodated the rights of the educationally handicapped into their basic philosophy and practice, as intended by the 94th Congress.

The ramifications of P.L. 94-142 and the concepts and reforms implied by it in terms of mainstreaming are the basis for change in teacher education preparation programs. Corrigan (1978) states that teacher education will not succeed if we continue to think of special education in a framework separate from regular education on any level. Until we rid ourselves of the dualism in our teacher education programs the public schools will only continue to mirror our dualism. He suggests a reform of all teacher education, not just departments of special education. All teachers must be prepared to implement the concepts mandated in P.L. 94-142.

There is a clear recognition that the schools of education are being faced with fundamental changes. This recognition reflects the changes that are taking place in the public schools. The changes in teacher preparation necessarily must correspond with the changes occurring in the public schools. Thus, the movement to which this Dean's Grant is linked is a revitalization of: the teaching training curriculum; the development of a healthy attitude toward the handicapped; an approach to teaching the handicapped which is primarily responsive to learning objectives rather than etiology or misconceptions; and providing regular educators with content which is useful in preparing and implementing the instructional objectives which will maximize educational success.

## Developments Leading to the Dean's Grant Project

During the 1977-78 academic year the College of Education, SIU-C, participated in several Illinois Office of Education sponsored meetings on P.L. 94-142. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and faculty members from both special education and regular education (elementary and secondary) attended the IOE meetings.

Discussion with the Administrative Staff following these meetings resulted in a commitment to an effort to institutionalize pre-service and in-service education to insure an awareness of the intent of P.L. 94-142 and to give training to students in early childhood, elementary, and secondary education on TEP's and mainstreaming. The Associate Deans for Undergraduate Studies and Graduate Studies assumed this responsibility.

An all-day workshop was scheduled on April 20, 1978. Dr. Robert Stoneburner, who had participated in special training with the Illinois State Board of Education and the Bureau of the Handicapped in Washington, and a member of the SIU-C Special Education faculty, organized and presented the major portion of the workshop. All center coordinators (supervisors of all in-classroom experiences), methods faculty, and Department Chairpersons were urged to attend the one-day session. Approximately forty faculty did participate, representing most of the departments involved in teacher training.

During the Summer of 1978 and early Fall, a plan was prepared for institutionalizing the concerns regarding special education in the curriculum of the Teacher Education Program. At that time, students in the SIU-C Teacher Education Program were introduced to special education in their first professional education sequence course, EDUC 201, The Teacher's Role in Public School Education. In this course, a member of the Special Education faculty discusses the need for teachers in this area and briefly discusses the role of a special education teacher. There is also, in the Teacher Education Program, a two hour elective course, EDUC 304, Individualization in Professional Education, Teaching the Special Needs Learner. In this course students are prepared to cope more effectively and comfortably with special needs learners in regular classrooms. Approximately one hundred twenty students enroll in this course each year. This course is an elective taken at the option of the student. The 201 course concentrates more on the special education teacher than the regular teacher utilizing or providing for handicapped children in their classroom. Thus neither course assures a pattern of learning about the handicapped for all students in the Teacher Education Program.

## The Plan for Institutionalizing Special Education Concerns in the Teacher Education Program

The plan which was developed and prepared as a proposal to the Office of Special Education for a Dean's Grant, was funded commencing June 1, 1979. For the first year of the

grant, the focus was on implementation of information in course syllabi of the Teacher Education Sequence courses. Among recipients of instruction and training for the first year of the grant were:

1. Dr. Jack Snowman, Dr. Jack Kelly, and Dr. Ronna Dillon, Coordinator of EDUC 301 Human Growth, Development and Learning, and six teaching assistants.

2. Dr. Barbara Battiste, Dr. Terry Shepherd, and Dr. Michael Jackson, Coordinator of EDUC 302, Basic Techniques and Procedures in Instruction, and four teaching assistants.

3. Dr. Lawrence Dennis, Dr. Arsene Boykin, Coordinators of EDUC 303, School and Society, Historical, Sociological and Philosophical Perspectives, other teaching faculty for this course and two teaching assistants.

During the school year of 1979-80, this faculty and teaching assistants received instruction which enabled them to incorporate in their course syllabi information and training for pre-service teachers in teacher education.

During the Summer of June 1 to September 15, 1979, the first three-and-a-half months of the project, bibliographies, list of outside support agencies, list of resources, list of instructional materials and diagnostic tools were solicited and developed in preparation for this training program. This portion of the grant was carried out under the direction of Dr. Robert Sedlak, Special Education trainer on the project, and two teaching assistants, Renee Rogers and George Vensel.

During the 1979-80 academic year various activities were conducted and numerous products were completed by the

project personnel, e.g., Selected Bibliography and Index, The Role of the Regular Educator in the Education of the Handicapped. The effectiveness of these activities and products are contained in the Evaluation section of this report.

The Dean's Grant is facilitated and supported by Dean Elmer J. Clark. Dr. Nancy Quisenberry, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, College of Education, has served as Project Director, and Dr. Sidney Miller, Special Education Trainer, started with the project in August, 1980.

The work of the project has been supported through a coordinated council which forms the base for institutional involvement and commitment. This council is made up of the Deans from the Colleges having Teacher Education Programs, the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, the department chairpersons, the Coordinator of Professional Education Experiences, and the Special Education Trainer. This council advises the Dean on matters related to development and implementation of the grant.

For the first year of this project (1979-80), the administrative team, under the direction of the Dean, identified three curriculum areas where incorporation and exposure of regular educators to handicapped individuals as learners can take place: 1) the general technique and procedures course, 2) the general educational psychology course in learning and development and 3) the history/ philosophy of education were targeted. These three courses

were selected because all the undergraduate students in the College of Education are required to take these courses for all educational degrees. During the first year of this project, eight instructors of the above courses, and 100 percent of the students enrolled in these courses were impacted by the 1979-80 OSE Dean's Grant funding effort.

Goals, objectives, and activities for this project are presented on the following pages. A PERT chart showing activities by month over the three year period follows.

| Goal | Objective | Activities |
|---|---|---|
| I. To create a set of materials and resources which can be used by the target faculty members in the training process | The grant personnel will develop lists and sets of materials to be used in implementing the project with faculty members. | 1. Develop bibliographics on all topics related to the implementation of this project.<br>2. Develop list of outside support agencies.<br>3. Develop a list of instructional materials.<br>4. Develop a list of diagnostic tools.<br>5. Set up center to house materials for project participants use. |
| II. To provide training for university personnel on P.L. 94-142 and the implications of the law for training teachers and administrators. | Grant personnel will provide training sessions for university faculty directly responsible for the training of teachers. | 1. Information will be disseminated to identified faculty.<br>2. Grant personnel and faculty will discuss and review materials disseminated.<br>3. Development of syllabi components by faculty for inclusion in their courses.<br>4. Lectures to university faculty by on-campus handicapped individuals. |
| III. To develop materials for use by students and faculty in the Teacher Education Program at SIU-C and to provide for dissemination of these materials. | Grant personnel and faculty members will develop materials for use in the Teacher Education Program at SIU-C. | 1. Development of booklets addressing:<br>a. Liability<br>b. Least restrictive alternative<br>c. P.L. 94-142<br>d. Individual Education Program<br>e. Due Process<br>f. Illinois Rules & Regulations |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 2. Description of components for course syllabi. |
| | | Dissemination of booklets and materials developed for course syllabi. | 1. Disseminate to faculty<br>2. Disseminate to university students.<br>3. Disseminate to other university faculty, administrators and students.<br>4. Disseminate to Illinois Office of Education<br>5. Disseminate to IACTE<br>6. Disseminate to etc. |
| IV. | To train and involve in the change process university personnel most directly responsible for the teacher education program. | Grant Personnel will provide information through seminars, lists, and resource materials to identified university faculty. | Recipients of Training:<br>1. Coordinators of Teacher Education Sequence Course (EDUC 301, 302, 303.) and teaching faculty for these courses.<br>2. Method course instructors<br>3. Center coordinators (supervisors of all clinical experiences including student teaching).<br>4. Administrative certification faculty members. |
| V. | To implement components developed for course syllabi in university course/ program. | University faculty will include components developed for this project in their courses. | 1. Lectures/Discussion<br>2. Observation of techniques<br>3. Class simulations<br>4. Field trips<br>5. Hands-on-experiences<br>6. Development of Individual Educational Program<br>7. Identification of handicapped students.<br>8. Obtain feedback from teachers in the field & review. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| VI. | Develop an administrative structure that enables the project administrators to insure the infusion of P.L. 94-142 and its educational ramifications in SIU-C professional education courses and field experiences. | The administrator will carry out all aspects of the personnel preparation project according to the aforementioned goals and objectives and Table 2 time-lines. | 1. The administrator will insure that all budgeting responsibilities are in accordance with Illinois, University, and O.S.E. guidelines.<br>2. The administrator will hire and provide direction to all project personnel.<br>3. The administrator will provide coordination between and among all university, projects and advisory committee representatives and participants.<br>4. The project administrator shall insure all goals, objectives, and activities are carried out within the time-lines specified in Table 2.<br>5. The project administrator will provide the support to insure all evaluation parameters are implemented and the data is used to revise or change existing training practices. |

PERT CHART OF ACTIVITIES FOR
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY-CARBONDALE DEAN'S GRANT

| | First Year (1979-80) | | | | | | | | | | | | Second Year (1980-81) | | | | | | | | | | | | Third Year (1981-82) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 |
| I. Preliminary Preparation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Develop bibliographies | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | = | = | | | | | | | | | | | * | * | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. List outside support agencies | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | * | * | * | | | | | | | | | |
| C. List of instruction materials | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | * | * | * | | | | | | | | | |
| D. List of diagnostic tools | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | * | * | * | | | | | | | | | |
| E. Develop Center for use of above materials | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| II. Training of University Personnel | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | | | | | = | * | * | * | * | | | | | | | | * | * | * | * | | | | | |
| A. Dissemination of information | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | | | * | * | * | * | * | | | | | | | | * | * | * | * | * | | |
| B. Feedback and review | | | | | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C. Syllabi component inclusion | | | | | | | | | | | | = | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | * | | | | | | | | | | | | * |
| D. Lectures to university personnel by on-campus handicapped individual | | | | | | | | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | * | | | | | | | | | | | * | | | | |
| III. Implementation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Lectures | | | | | | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| B. Observation of techniques | | | | | | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| C. Class simulations | | | | | | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |

* Projected activities

= Activities completed as of October 1, 1980

-11-

| | First Year (1979-80) | | | | | | | | | | | | Second Year (1980-81) | | | | | | | | | | | | Third Year (1981-82) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 |
| III. Implementation (cont.) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D. Field trips | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| E. Hands-on experience | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| F. Development of individual educational program | | | | | | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| G. Identify handicapped students | | | | | | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H. Field related feedback and review | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| IV. University Personnel To Be Trained | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Coordinators of Professional Education Course Sequence and the faculty | | | | = | = | = | | = | = | = | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. Methods course instructors | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | = | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C. Center coordinators (supervisors of clinical experiences) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D. Faculty of Adm. Certificate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| V. Development and Dissemination | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Development of booklets addressing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Teacher liability | | | | | = | = | = | | = | = | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Least rest. alternative | | | | | = | = | = | | = | = | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

* Projected activities

= Activities completed as of October 1, 1980

| | First Year (1979-80) | | | | | | | | | | | | Second Year (1980-81) | | | | | | | | | | | | Third Year (1981-82) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 |
| V. Development and Dissimination (cont.) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. Public Law 94-142 | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. Individual education program | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. Due process | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. Illinois rules and regulations | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Syllabi for Courses | | | | | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. Dissemination of Books To: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. University faculty | | | | | | | | | = | = | = | = | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 2. University students | | | | | | | | | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 3. Other university faculty, administrators & students | | | | | | | | | | | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 4. Illinois Office of Education | | | | | | | | | | | | | * | * | * | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. ACTE | | | | | = | | | | = | | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | |
| 6. Etc. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| VI. Administration | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Budgeting | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| B. Personnel | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| C. Coordination | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Faculty | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 2. Advisory Board | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

* Projected Activities

= Activities completed as of October 1, 1980

| | First Year (1979-80) | | | | | | | | | | | | Second Year (1980-81) | | | | | | | | | | | | Third Year (1981-82) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 |
| VI. Administration (cont.) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Project staff | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| D. Implementation of project | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| E. Evaluation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. of products | | | | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | * | * | * | * | | | | | | | | | * | * | * | * |
| 2. of university course impact on students | | | | | | | | | - | - | - | - | | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 3. of student behavior in the field | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 4. university faculty receptivity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |

* Projected activities

\- Activities completed as of October 1, 1980

## Evaluation Methodology

The Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIU-C) evaluation is based on the following principles:

First, all data collected must be based on either performance criteria or measure attitude.

Second, all data must be usable in enabling SIU-C to modify existing programs or build new and innovated programs.

Third, data must be collected on all persons involved in the delivery of services either on-campus or off-campus.

Fourth, the data collected per activity or product shall reflect only on that activity or product.

Fifth, the collective data across products and activity, and across time will be used to evaluate the efficacy of the SIU-C effort.

### Populations

Populations that were trained and evaluated during the first year include:

1. University perscnnel teaching specified general content courses.
2. University personnel teaching generic and content specific methods courses.
3. University administrative personnel required to assist in the implementation and maintenance of efforts related to the Dean's Grant.

4. Undergraduate students prepared to serve all children and youth in the public and private school and in such state agencies as Mental Health and the Department of Corrections.
   This includes those in:
   a. general information courses.
   b. generic methods courses.
   c. field-based student teaching.

Activities

The evaluation was conducted on experiences presented during lectures, panel discussion, learning laboratory experiences, field based student teaching, practicum experiences, and role playing.

Settings

The activities occurred in conference rooms, lecture halls, learning laboratories for the development of instructional media, instructional materials, instructional strategies, and instructional tactics.

## INSTRUMENTS

Evaluation of the products developed through the Dean's Grant were achieved using three evaluation procedures: a) Student and Faculty Surveys, b) Criterion Reference Tests, and c) Observational Checklists, as shown on the "Assessment of Product Information" chart.

## Assessment of Product Information

| Products and Workshops | Instruments | | | Settings | | | | | Populations | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Student Survey | Criterion Reference Tests | Teacher Survey | Lab Experiences | Panel Discussions | Field Based Experience | Student Teaching Experience | Lectures | University Personnel General Courses | University Personnel Methods Courses | University Administrative Personnel | University Field Personnel | Public School Teachers and Administrators | Undergraduates and Graduate Students |
| Bibliography | * | | * | | | | | * | * | | * | | | * |
| Diagnostic Tests | * | | * | * | | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * | * |
| Annotated Bibliography | * | | * | | | | | * | * | | * | | | * |
| Book List | * | | * | | | | | * | * | | * | | | * |
| Role of the Regular Educator | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | * | | | * |
| History of Special Education | * | | * | | | | | * | * | | * | | | * |
| Litigation and Legislation | * | | * | | | | | * | * | | * | | | * |
| Characteristics of Handicapped | * | * | * | | * | | * | * | * | | * | | | * |
| Instructional Materials | * | | * | * | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| List of Agencies | | | * | | | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Materials Information Center | | | | | | * | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * |
| Glossary | * | | * | * | | | | * | * | | * | | | * |
| Instructional Methods Handbook | * | * | * | | | | | * | | * | * | * | * | * |
| Observational Checklist | | | * | | | * | * | | | | * | * | * | * |
| Workshops | * | | * | | | | | * | | | | | | * |

| Products and Workshops | Information | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Students' Attitudes | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Litigation | Legislation | Due Process | I.E.P. | Characteristics of Handicapped | Published Articles | Published Books | Testing Materials | Instructional Strategies | Definition of Terms | Role of Parent | Role of Student | Role of Regular Education Teacher | Role of School | Instructional Materials | History of Special Education | | Support Service | Mainstreaming | Placement | Handicapped as People | Handicapped as Learners | I.E.P. Responsibilities | Parent Rights | Student Rights | School Role | Special Educators | | |
| Bibliography | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | |
| Diagnostic Tests | | | | * | | | | * | | | | | | * | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Annotated Bibliography | | | | | * | * | * | | | | | | * | * | | | | | * | * | * | * | | | | | | | |
| Book List | * | * | * | * | * | | * | | * | * | * | * | * | * | | | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | |
| Role of the Regular Educator | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | * | | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | |
| History of Special Education | * | * | * | | | * | * | | | | | | | | | * | | | * | * | | * | * | | | | | | |
| Litigation and Legislation | * | * | * | | | * | * | | | | | | * | | | * | | | * | * | | * | * | | | | | | |
| Characteristics of Handicapped | | | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | | | * | | * | * | | | | | | * | * | | | | | | |
| Instructional Materials | | | | | | | * | | * | | | | | | * | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| List of Agencies | | | | * | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Materials Information Center | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | | * | * | | * | * | * | | | * | | |
| Glossary | * | * | | * | * | | | | | * | | | | | | | | | | | | * | | | | | | | |
| Instructional Methods Handbook | | | | * | * | | | | * | | | | * | | | | | | | | | * | | | | | | | |
| Observational Checklist | | | | * | | | | | | | | | * | | | | | | | | * | * | * | | | | | | |
| Workshops | * | * | * | * | | | | | | * | | | * | * | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## University Faculty Personnel Survey

The process of product development included the professional input of the faculty responsible for the dissemination of each product and its information. The faculty evaluated each product's relevancy, format and usefulness to them as instructors and to the students enrolled in their courses. A space for further recommendations was a part of the survey.

### Faculty and Student Survey

All products disseminated to students were accompanied by a survey form. Faculty and students were asked to respond to the relevancy, format, and usefulness of the specific product.

### Checklists

Students involved in field based experiences and students' practicums were measured on their ability to develop appropriate teaching strategies and implement a program of instruction for handicapped students.

Faculty and administrative personnel were evaluated on their receptivity to, and/or inclusion of, information concerning the education of the handicapped into their course content.

### Data Treatment

Survey data was collected and analyzed to determine the percent of positive and negative responses to the products developed and disseminated.

Results of the criterion reference pre- and post-test scores were analyzed to determine the students' gains in information, attitude changes, ability to develop instructional materials and strategies, and their competency in working with handicapped populations.

The criterion acceptance level established for inclusions of material in the course, is that, at least 80 percent of the faculty, teaching assistance, and students, must find the materials moderately "useful", "relevant", and presented in an understandable manner. The 80 percent criteria was also used by SIU-C faculty members in measuring the proficiency of pre-service teachers presenting information in their various courses addressing the needs of the handicapped, the responsibility of school personnel to serve these students, and the procedures to be used to instruct such students.

## RESULTS

The following data was collected Spring Semester, 1980, by the Dean's Grant personnel and instructors of the regular education core sequence (Educ 301, 302, and 303).

This data reflects input from 15 faculty members and 182 students enrolled in these courses. What follows will be utilized to determine the impact of the products that were developed and disseminated during the 1980-1981 academic year.

Faculty Survey

The following materials were disseminated to the instructors of the prerequisite courses in the Professional Education Sequence, which is required of all students enrolled in the Southern Illinois University, Teacher Education Program. These courses include: Education 301, Human Growth, Development, and Learning; Education 302, Basic Techniques and Procedures in Instruction; Education 303, School Society: Historical, Sociological, and Philosophical Perspectives. The instructors of these courses evaluated each product's relevance, format, and usefulness to them as instructors, and the potential usefulness to the students enrolled in their classes. The following is the list of materials developed for the various classes:

1) Characteristics of Handicapped Student
2) The Role of the Regular Educator in the Education of the Handicapped
3) Glossary
4) Selected Annotated Bibliography
5) Bibliography
6) List of Agencies
7) Diagnostic Tools
8) Litigation and Legislation
9) History of Special Education

Fifteen instructors, faculty, and teaching assistants responsible for the instruction of the prerequisite courses in the professional education sequence reviewed the nine

products and completed the questionnaire attached to each set of materials (Appendix A) concerning the applicability of the materials in their individual courses.

Instructors (N=4) of the first course in the professional education sequence (Educ 301, Human Growth, Development, and Learning), reviewed the products that were pertinent to their course: Characteristics of Handicapped Students and Glossary of Terms. The instructors (N=4) reviewed these two sets of materials and agreed (N=4) that the materials were presented in an understandable manner and were relevant and useful to them and their students as shown in Table I.

Instructors of Education 302 reviewed the following sets of materials: The Role of the Regular Educator in the Education of the Handicapped; Selected Annotated Bibliography; Bibliography; List of Agencies; and Diagnostic Tools. Of the aforementioned materials, The Role of the Regular Educator in the Education of the Handicapped received positive responses from all the reviewers (N=4) on all three evaluation criteria as shown in Table I. The Selected Annotated Bibliography received a positive evaluation (100% from the four instructors) concerning the style of presentation and usefulness of the materials to the instructors and students of Educ 302 as shown in Table I. Three of the four instructors sampled who teach Education 302 indicated that the Bibliography and Diagnostic Tools

Table I

Results of Faculty Survey*

| Questions | Characteristics of Handicapped Students | | The Role of the Regular Educator in the Education of Handicapped | | Glossary | | Selected Annotated Bibliography | | Bibliography | | List of Agencies | | Diagnostic Tests | | Litigation and Legislation | | History of Special Education | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Do you feel this information is relevant to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) you? | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| b) your students? | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| Do you feel this information to be useful to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) you? | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| b) your students? | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Is this information presented in an understandable manner? | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| *Disseminated in either Educ 301, 302, or 303 | * | | * | | * | | * | | | | | | | | | | | |

were useful and relevant to them but believed that their students would benefit from this information. Two of of these same instructors suggested that the diagnostic information be considered for inclusion in one of the methods courses. The instructors of Educ 302 also indicated that the List of Agencies was presented well (N=6), but did not meet the necessary criteria for inclusion in their course.

Materials developed for Educ 303 include: Litigation and Legislation: the History of Special Education. Although the initial review of the content of the written materials was favorable, the instructors of Education 303 indicated they preferred to present this information via computerized instruction and multi-media packages.

Student Survey

Materials that were considered appropriate and pertinent by the instructors of Educ 301 and Educ 302 were then included in their curriculum and syllabi. Further evaluation of the materials was conducted via a survey of all students enrolled in these courses, and administration of pre- and post-criterion reference tests. The results of this survey were positive with over 95% of the students surveyed responding favorably to questions concerning the relevancy, usefulness, and presentation of the information as shown in Table .

Table II

Results of Student Survey

| Questions | Characteristics of Handicapped Students | | The Role of the Regular Educator in the Education of Handicapped | | Glossary | | Selected Annotated Bibliography | | Bibliography | | List of Agencies | | Diagnostic Tests | | Litigation and Legislation | | History of Special Education | | Workshop Student Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Do you feel this information is relevant to you? | 54 | 1 | 72 | 1 | 50 | 4 | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | | 6 | 0 |
| Do you feel this information will be useful to you? | 54 | 1 | 70 | 3 | 50 | 4 | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | | 6 | 0 |
| Do you feel this information is presented in an understandable manner? | 55 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 54 | 0 | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | | 6 | 0 |

Student Teacher Workshop

Students currently involved in student teaching practicum participated in a two-hour workshop concerning their role in the education of the handicapped. Student response on the survey, as shown in Table II, revealed that they felt the presentation was beneficial.

## PRE-POST TESTS

Two criterion reference tests were developed to assess the impact of the materials disseminated to the student enrolled in Education 301 and Education 303. These tests were designed to establish whether the students had achieved a more complete understanding of the issues concerning the education of the handicapped. The pre-post tests included questions designed to assess whether the student attitudes toward the education of the handicapped had changed as a result of reading the material developed by the Dean's Grant personnel and experiencing classroom lectures which parallel the materials. The testing procedures in Education 303 are being integrated into the computerized or multi-media instructional programs, and no evaluation tool has been developed.

Results

An eight item pre-test was administered to 95 students enrolled in Education 301. The mean score on the pre-test was 4.2. The selected post-test was administered to 76 students. The mean score of the post-test was 4.5. Although

Themean score on the post-test was higher than the pre-test, the difference was not statistically significant.

Student attitudes toward the placement of the handicapped in the regular classroom significantly changed during the course of the 1980-81 semester. Pre-test scores indicated that only 39% believe that the education of the handicapped would be best accomplished in the regular classroom. The post-test scores revealed that 61% believed that regular classroom placement would be beneficial to the handicapped student. Attitudinal questions concerning the role of the regular educator in identification of handicapped students and the training of regular educators in the education of the handicapped was affirmative, but not significantly when compared to pre-test responses. Pre- and post-tests developed for Education 302 were not administered because of the lateness in the Spring Semester. The instructors and grant personnel felt that a more accurate assessment would occur during the Fall 1980 Semester.

Questionnaire

During the Fall 1980 Semester, the Quisenberry/Miller questionnaire was administered to incoming students who indicated that they are majoring in the field of education. Results of this initial survey were not available at the time of this report's preparation. (See Appendix B for questionnaire)

## SUMMARY

Evaluation of the Dean's Grant initiated during the first year of the project indicates that the target audience has been favorably impacted.

### Faculty Receptivity

Faculty responsible for Education 301, Education 302, and Education 303, have included pertinent material and information concerning the education of handicapped into their course syllabi.

### Students

Students have been presented with various informational packages relevant to their role in the education of handicapped students. Their responses to the materials were favorable, with 95% judging the information as useful and relevant to them. Also, the students have demonstrated an altered view of the rights of the handicapped to be educated in the regular classroom. Most students now support their integration into the mainstream of education.

Goals and objectives have been accomplished within the time frames specified in the proposal. Thus, changes in goals, objectives, and time frames are deemed unnecessary by the project personnel.

## REFERENCE

Corrigan, C., "Political and Moral Contexts that Produced P.L. 94-142, Journal of Teacher Education, 29:10-14, November/December 1978.

Appendix A

## EVALUATION FORM

1. Do you feel that this information is relevant to you?

   Yes _____ No _____

2. Do you feel this information will be useful to you?

   Yes _____ No _____

3. Is this information presented in an understandable manner?

   Yes _____ No _____

4. Comments:

Appendix B

ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE OF EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

1. Identification of students with learning problems/handicaps should begin with:

   a) the regular classroom teacher.
   b) special educators.
   c) psychologists.
   d) social workers.

2. Regular educators:

   a) should be trained to mainstream handicapped students.
   b) are not expected to teach handicapped students.
   c) should learn about handicapped students on a volunteer basis.
   d) need extra training to work with the handicapped.

3. Circle the person or persons who you feel should be involved in the development of a handicapped student's I.E.P.

   a) Parents
   b) Regular classroom teacher
   c) Special educators
   d) Student
   e) All of the above

4. Preparing handicapped students for job awareness and job training will be:

   a) a benefit to the handicapped.
   b) a benefit to the handicapped and the community.
   c) misuse of tax dollars.
   d) a waste of time.

5. The problems of the handicapped are:

   a) too difficult for regular educators to mediate in the regular classroom.
   b) can only be mediated by special educators.
   c) can be mediated cooperatively by special and regular educators.
   d) a burden on the schools.

6. Of the behaviors listed below, which one <u>best</u> describes a student who has a visual perception problem?

   a) Has difficulty seeing objects that are far away
   b) Rubbing his eyes frequently
   c) Inability to discriminate between different symbols
   d) Inability to communicate with sign language

7. Which of the following is an underlying deficit exhibited by a student who is having an auditory perception problem?

   a) Inability to discriminate sounds
   b) Watching lips of someone communicating with him
   c) Uses sign language
   d) Inability to hear a stimulus

8. If a student is experiencing difficulties in academic or social interactions, and is suspected of being educationally handicapped, the first thing the classroom teacher is required to do is:

   a) send a letter to the parents of the student.
   b) implement an individualized education program.
   c) make a referral.
   d) develop a special program for the student.

9. Which are the major sensory areas that are important to the educational growth of a student?

   a) Speech
   b) Vision
   c) Hearing
   d) b and c
   e) all of the above

10. Which of the persons below have been delegated the responsibility for referring a student for a case study evaluation?

    a) Regular classroom teacher
    b) Parents
    c) Special education teacher
    d) Any one of the above

11. The primary role of the multidisciplinary team is to:

    a) do preschool screening.
    b) assess the handicapped student's level of functioning.
    c) refer handicapped students for a case study evaluation.
    d) a and b
    e) all of the above

12. The following are mandated components of the Individualized Education Program except:

    a) the student's level of performance.
    b) due process hearing.
    c) short-term objectives.
    d) special education and related services.
    e) annual goals.

13. An Individual Education Program is:

    a) a legally binding document.
    b) only for handicapped students.
    c) for all children in our schools.
    d) b and c
    e) all of the above

14. Regular classroom teachers are responsible for participating in the education of the handicapped due to the Congressional legislation of:

a) the Hatch Act.
b) the 1964 Civil Rights Act.
c) the Adjournment Resolution of 1975.
d) P.L. 94-142.

15. According to Deno's cascade which of the following is the least restrictive environment possible for handicapped students?

a) Special education classroom
b) Regular classroom
c) Special school
d) Regular classroom with supportive services, e.g. resource room
e) Institutions

16. Segregation of handicapped individuals was supported by the following philosopher(s).

a) Plato
b) John Locke
c) Jean Jacque Rosseau
d) none of the above

17. Which of the following individual(s) are considered to be pioneers in the education of the handicapped?

a) Jean-Marc Gaspand Itard
b) Edward Sequin
c) Maria Montessori
d) all of the above

18. The constitutional amendment that requires states to provide equal protection of the law to all its citizens is:

a) 5th amendment
b) 14th amendment
c) 6th amendment
d) 4th amendment

19. The Supreme Court decision that assured that those states providing educational services to any citizens must be provided to all is

a) Doe vs. Board of School Directors of the city of Milwaukee
b) Spangler vs. Board of Education
c) Brown et. al. vs. Board of Education of Topeka et. al.
d) Beattie vs. State Board of Education